REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-22 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 14 and 16 have been amended as set forth herein.

Claims 1-22 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. The Applicants make the aforementioned amendments and subsequent arguments to place this application in condition for allowance. Alternatively, the Applicants make these amendments and offer these arguments to properly frame the issues for appeal. In this Response, the Applicants make no admission concerning any now moot rejection or objection, and affirmatively deny any position, statement or averment of the Examiner that was not specifically addressed herein.

I.   **CLAIM REJECTIONS -- 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3, 5-14, 16 and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,665,297 to Hariguchi, et al. (hereafter *"Hariguchi"*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,547 to Douceur, et al. (hereafter *"Douceur"*). Claims 2 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hariguchi, in view of Douceur, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,784,699 to McMahon, et al. (hereinafter *"McMahon"*). Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Hariguchi* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0027479 to Delaney, et al. (hereinafter *"Delaney")*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,612 to Tal, et al. (hereinafter *"Tal"*). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In *ex parte* examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142; *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1262, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention is always upon the Patent Office. MPEP § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Only when a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established does the burden shift to the applicants to produce evidence of nonobviousness. MPEP § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). If the Patent Office does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the applicants are entitled to grant of a patent. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Currently amended independent Claim 1 recites an address lookup structure that includes:

> a plurality of hash tables each storing prefixes for address lookups;
> a content addressable memory storing at least some prefixes for which a collision occurs within at least one of the hash tables; and
> a hashing lookup search mechanism that comprises:
> a routing table implemented with selective hashing for a plurality of prefixes with different lengths; and
> a plurality of memory blocks, wherein each hash table is allocated a group of the memory blocks based on a size of the respective hash table and a pre-assigned maximum number of allocated blocks.

The Applicants respectfully submit that *Hariguchi* and *Douceur*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the aforementioned features of Claim 1. In particular, it is submitted that *Douceur* does not provide a disclosure that remedies the conceded deficiencies of

Hariguchi. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, that asserted combination is likewise deficient.

For example, *Douceur* does not teach or suggest "a plurality of memory blocks, wherein each hash table is allocated a group of the memory blocks based on a size of the respective hash table and a pre-assigned maximum number of allocated blocks." In the rejection of Claim 3, the Office Action asserts that "the size of the primary memory 22 is inherently predefined and a hash table can not [sic] be allocated more than the size of the primary memory." (*Office Action*, page 3). However, *Douceur* does not teach a <u>pre-assigned</u> maximum number of memory blocks. A size of the primary memory does not teach or suggest a "pre-assigned maximum number of blocks." Therefore, *Douceur* does not provide a disclosure that remedies the deficiencies of *Hariguchi.*

Claims 10 and 14 have been amended similarly. As such, these claims are allowable for the same or similar reasons as Claim 1.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection with respect to Claims 1, 10 and 14, and their dependent claims, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicants assert that the remaining Claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an early allowance of such Claims.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@munckcarter.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees (including any extension of time fees) connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNCK CARTER, LLP

Date: July 13, 2010

William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Box 802432
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: *wmunck@munckcarter.com*